



---

Notes on East European Toponymy and Some Reminiscences of Petar Skok

Author(s): G. Nandriş

Source: *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 36, No. 87 (Jun., 1958), pp. 496-501

Published by: the [Modern Humanities Research Association](#) and [University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4204966>

Accessed: 12/06/2014 21:50

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Modern Humanities Research Association and University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Slavonic and East European Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Königinhofer Handschrift und ihre Schwestern' touched off a series of polemics in which Nebeský was chief defendant over the next two years (1858–9).<sup>4</sup> In his defence Nebeský enjoyed the support of Palacký as well as that of Hattala, who argued the authenticity of *RK* on linguistic grounds (!).<sup>5</sup> Meanwhile Büdinger's argument, viz. that the story of the expulsion of the Poles from Prague derived from the chronicler Cosmas—a view which he later revised in favour of the 16th-century chronicler Hájek—provoked anger in Museum circles.

Nebeský's retorts were of the feeblest. The Cosmas account and that of *RK* were basically dissimilar. Moreover *RK* was proved to be genuine, since four letters on the subject had been exchanged between Hanka and the now deceased Svoboda between the years 1817 and 1818. 'Is this to be construed', argued Nebeský with little logic, 'as the language of one forger to another in some disreputable trade? Hanka and Svoboda would never join the ranks of a Macpherson or a Simonides.'

But the two blacks failed to make a white, and the convenient death of Hanka in 1861 and the retirement of Nebeský on a sick pension in the same year caused the controversy to be shelved for a while. The first phase of the hoax ended on an ironical note. Hanka's post as Director of the Museum Library and Nebeský's editorship of the Journal both fell to Vrt'átko. The library grew to 45,000 volumes in only eight months. To this magnificent collection was added Hanka's meagre pile, a parcel of books which his widow sold to the Museum for 500 florins. Hanka's much-vaunted 'vast collection of letters' was never heard of again.

The sequel is pathetic. In 1864, despite the disclaimers of Dobrovský and the exposure by Fejfalik and others, we find Vojtěch Šafařík, son of the great antiquarian scholar, reading to the historical section of the Czech Museum an exegesis of *RZ* from the residual papers of his late father—who was deceived to the very last.

## Notes on East European Toponymy and Some Reminiscences of Petar Skok

G. NANDRIŞ

### I

'Sur quelques noms de lieu d'origine ukrainienne en Roumanie' was first published as a five-page article by the late distinguished Romance scholar Petar Skok in 1930. (Cf. *Žbirnyk Zachodoznaustva Vseukrajinskoji Akademiji Nauk u Kyjevi*, pp. 71–7.) The findings of this toponymic study are used to reconstruct the early ethnic history of South-East Europe. By assuming

<sup>4</sup> Büdinger's exposure and the defence is in *ČČM*, Prague, 1859, II, p. 198 and III, p. 397.

<sup>5</sup> For Hattala's linguistic defence of the MSS., see *ČČM*, Prague, 1858, p. 600; 1859, III, p. 326; 1860, I, p. 59.

that three place-names in eastern Rumania can be explained through East Slavonic, the conclusion is drawn that the Ukrainians once inhabited this region. Skok presents the result of his researches cautiously and recognises that he does not possess sufficient proof for some of his statements. His conclusion is expressed in a hypothetical way: 'If this last explanation is correct, then the names of the three Rumanian towns confirm the extension of the ancient Ukrainian territory to the river Danube on the borders of Bulgaria.' This hypothesis becomes a certainty to the editor of Petar Skok's reprinted article in 1957,<sup>1</sup> for in the *résumé* which precedes it he states that Skok came to the conclusion that 'the Ukrainians inhabited the entire territory of present-day Rumania from *Dorohoi* in the north to *Giurgiu* in the south, opposite Bulgaria'. The third town of this philological axis, *Buzău*, lies midway between the two.

A philological analysis of the three toponyms deprives this ethnic hypothesis of any basis. For the confusion of race and language which is sometimes found in the onomastic studies of this region, the reader is referred to the article published in this *Review* (XXXIV, 83, 1956) under the title 'The Relations between Toponymy and Ethnology in Rumania'. The remarks which follow will deal only with the philological aspects of our three toponyms. There are phonetic and semantic difficulties in the way of explaining *Dorohoi* with the aid of an East Slavonic dialect. The ending *-oi* opposes an explanation through a dialect of Ukrainian type, where the adjectival ending would appear as *-ei*. The voiced aspirate *h* does not admit an explanation through Russian. Moreover, an adjective is unusual as a place-name.

Skok is aware of these difficulties and attempts to avoid them by assuming the existence of a Ukrainian form *\*Dorohun* on the pattern of the Serbian *Dragun*. In support of this reconstructed form he quotes old forms of this place-name recorded in 15th-century Slavo-Rumanian charters: *Dorogun*/(*Dorohun*) (subst.), *Dorohunskyj* (adj.). However, this personal name does not exist in Ukrainian, where the ending *-un* is used to derive substantives from verbs; and *Dorohoi* appears only once among many other toponyms derived from the corresponding South Slavonic etymon. Such toponyms extend over Rumanian territory from the neighbourhood of Serbia, in the Dolj district, to the neighbourhood of the East Slavonic territory in the north. Here are some examples: *Drăgoi*, *Drăgan*, *Drăgănoi*, *Drăgoeasa*, *Drăgoeșit*, *Drăgunoi*, *Drăguna*, etc. The language of the chanceries and of the Church, was Slavonic in the Rumanian Principalities for three centuries, with East Slavonic influence in the Northern Principality of Moldavia, where forms with *trat* and *torot*, representing original *\*tort*, appear side by side. Proceeding from these premises and bearing in mind the principle that toponyms should be studied in their philological and cultural-historical contexts, it is more satisfactory to explain the name of the town *Dorohoi* as a transposition of a South Slavonic etymon into an East Slavonic form. Such 'toponymic calques' are not exceptional in this region.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. P. Skok, *Sur quelques noms de lieu d'origine ukrainienne en Roumanie* (Académie Ukrainienne Libre de Sciences, Onomastica, No. 18, Winnipeg, 1957).

It might appear that the prototype of *Dorohoi* is \**Drăgunoi*, derived from Serbian *Dragun*. However, the adjective *Dorogunskij* and the difficulty of deriving *Dorohoi* from a \**Dorohunoi* oppose this etymology. If we recall however that the suffix *-oaia*, representing the Lat. *-onea*, appears in Rumanian toponyms, e.g. *Drăgoaia*, that the same suffix may be amplified with a Slavonic *-k-* suffix, e.g. *lupoaiē* and *lupoaičā* 'she-wolf', and that the corresponding masculine *-oneus* > *-oñ* > *-oi* appears in toponyms and patronymics, we can explain the ending *-oi* in *Dorohoi* as a merger of *-un* and *-oñ* > *-oi*. (Cf. S. Puşcariu, *Studii istro-române*, II, p. 311, where the patronymic *-oi* suffix is explained as a merger of Lat. *-oneus* and Croatian *-oje*.) In the light of this phonetic analysis, the 15th-century forms of the charters *Dorohun*, *Dorohunski*, and the present-day form in the local dialect *Dorohoncean*, 'a man from Dorohoi', are old forms of the 'toponymic calque' *Dorohoi*, which is a transposition into East Slavonic of a South Slavonic \**Drag* + *un/ñ* > \**Dorohoñ(ski)* > *Dorohoi*.

Even less probability attaches to Skok's attempt to derive Rumanian *Buzău* through a Ukrainian *Buziv* < *Buzov* < *būzovŭ* < *būzŭ* 'elder-tree', assuming that this Slavonic noun was substituted for the old *Museus* (*Μουσέος*).

The old forms of this river-name were examined in a study, published in 1923, by V. Pârvan ('Considerații asupra unor nume de râuri daco-scitice' in *Analele Academiei Române*, Mem. Sect. Ist., s. III, t. 1, Bucarest, 1923, pp. 1-31). This study was not known to Skok, who remarks that 'the ancient form needs special study (p. 12, note 2). On the basis of the Thracian names of persons, Pârvan associates *Buzău* with the root *buz-*, *buza-* and draws the conclusion that this river, whose source is in the Transylvanian Alps 'is evidently of Thracian origin. The root *buz-*, *buza-* is well known in Thracian. The form with *m* (*Μουσέος*, *Μπουσέος*) is a regular Thracian variant (cf. P. Kretschmer, *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*, p. 236). It seems that the name of this river was continued in Rumanian without the mediation of any other language.' A latinised *Museus* could be continued by *Buzău*, as *deus* is continued by *zău*.

The change *m* > *b* makes no difficulty, as it is supported by other examples (cf. Pauly, *Real-Encyklopädie*, II, p. 269, s.v. *Bendis*). The form *Μουσέος* is recorded in the 4th century in the *Passio S. Sabae* cap. 7 (Anal. Bolland. XXXI, p. 220, Migne, G. XXXII, p. 2544), where we read of the martyrdom of the Gothic Christian St Sava who was drowned in the river *Buzău* (p. 372), at the order of the king of the Visigoths, Atanarik. As the basic Christian terminology in Rumanian goes back to the 4th century, the name of this river could very well represent the Latin *Museus*.

However, the Slavonic chancery language might have interfered with the phonetic aspect of this toponym, in view of the recorded forms *Buzograd*, *Buzov* (15th century), *Buzovski*, *Buzevski*, *Buzăvski* (17th-century adjectives; cf. M. Gaster, *Chrestomatie Română*, I, pp. 98, 110). All these late forms are Slavonic and derive from *Buz-ov* possibly by association

with *buză* 'lip' in Rumanian. The Hungarian *Bodza*, the name of the upper part of the river in the mountains, and the Saxon *Boza-markt* may go back to a Rumanian *Buzău*. The metaphony (Umlaut) of the Saxon *Büssenmarkt*, explained by Skok through an hypothetical Ukrainian *Buziv*, could derive from a Rumanian *Buzău*, pronounced by the Transylvanian Germans as *Buzeu* > *Büssen*. The ending *-ău* is common in Rumanian toponyms and goes back to Hungarian (Cuman?) *-ó* or Slavonic *-ov*: *Bacău*, *Ceahlău*, *Rarău*, *Giulău*, etc. (cf. Hung. *bakó* 'hangman', Hung. *szabó* > Rum. *sabău* 'tailor'). All these forms do not require a Ukrainian intermediary, for they represent Rumanian phonetic changes, whatever their origin may be.

Skok is aware of the difficulty of deriving *Buzău* from a Ukrainian *Buziv* < *Buzov*, because *Buziv* would have given Rumanian *Buziu* as *tardivus* became *târziu* (cf. *beŭiv*, *beŭiu*, *pistiu*, etc.), as it is impossible to derive *Cernăuți* from a *Černiyci* < *Černovce*; but *Cernăuți* < *Černovce* follows a regular phonetic development in Rumanian. To avoid this difficulty Skok states (p. 11, note 4) that Rumanian *ă* goes back to *e*, *i* < *o* in a closed syllable. The delabialisation of long *o* in a closed syllable passes through several stages of the diphthongisation of long *o* (cf. N. Trubetzkoy, 'Einiges über die russische Lautentwicklung und die Auflösung der gemeinrussischen Spracheinheit' in *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie*, I, pp. 299–300; N. van Wijk, 'Les langues slaves de l'est' in *Le Monde slave*, 1937, pp. 35–6). If this is so, then Skok's explanation is based on the assumption that one of the intermediate diphthongs, say *-ue-*, is the phonematic correspondent of Rumanian *-ă-* in *-ău*. However, Skok assumes only that *o* developed into *e*, *i*, and that a Ukrainian *\*Buzeu* became in Rumanian *Buzău*. It is hardly possible to equate *e* with *ue* and to base an etymology on two hypothetical assumptions.

The southern end of this philological axis lies on the Danube. It is the name of the old market-town *Giurgiu*, to the south of Bucarest. Skok attempts to explain it through Ukrainian. In his explanation he twice introduces a cautious doubt, and his conclusion begins with 'if this explanation is correct'. He is aware of the hypothetical character of his inference, but his editor does not take this into account in drawing his historical conclusion. Skok proceeds from a form *Djurdjevo* in which the ending *-ev-* should have changed into *-iv* as in *Kyjiv*. From *Djurdjiv*, by changing the stress from the ending to the stem vowel, he obtains the Rumanian form *Giurgiu*.

Skok assumes that *Djurdjevo* is the Bulgarian form of the name, although Karadžić's dictionary shows it to be Serbian, derived from the name *Djurdje* 'George', and A. T. Iliev spells it Гюргево not \*Джурджево ('Romanska toponimija ot slavjano-bălgarski proizhod', in *Sbornik na Bălg. Akad. Nauk.*, XVII, *klon. ist. fil.*, Sofia, 1925, p. 11). The Ruthenian form of *Georgius* appears in Rumanian onomastics as *Iuri*, *Iroaie*, *Iurgus*. It is difficult to see how the stem could be regarded as Ukrainian, and how the soft ending *-ev-* became *-iv-* > *-iu*, and why the stress was withdrawn in Rumanian, where the stress, on the contrary, moves to the derivative element.

On the other hand, toponyms derived from the Serbian form of *Djurdje* appear all over the Rumanian lands, for instance, *Giurgița* (in the Dolj district in the neighbourhood of Serbia), *Giurgeni* (in the districts of Ialomița, Roman, Brăila, Tecuci), *Giurgești* (in the districts of Fălciu and Suceava in the north), etc. The early political and cultural relations between the Rumanian Principalities and Serbia as well as the important place of St George in both folklores explain this Serbian form of the Rumanian name. Other Serbian toponyms like *Romanaț*, and the fact that *Giurgiu* is situated in the region called *Vlașca* by the Slavs are not irrelevant to the problem under discussion.

The name of the town *Giurgiu* is first recorded in 1399. That means that it existed before the foundation of the Principality of Walachia (1320). It is situated on the ruins of an early Roman settlement, and legend tells of a Genoese castle of S. Giorgio in that place. But philological analysis can be based only on a Serbian form. To complete our review of facts, mention should be made that a Rumanian chronicle of 1782 records the form *Djurdjuv* (ДѣрДѣвѣ, cf. M. Gaster, *Chrestomatie Română*, II, p. 127).

The Serbian basic form is *Djurdje* + masc. possessive ending *-vũ* > *Djurdjev* (*grad*) (cf. *Djurdjev dan*). By assimilation of the final syllable to the first we obtain the form *Giurgiuv* > *Giurgiu*.

Other toponyms formed in the same way support this etymology, for instance, *Panciu(l)* < \**Pančev* is derived from the same patronymic as *Pancu(l)*, *Pancea*; *Garbaciū* < \**Gârbačev* from *Gârbu*, from which other toponyms like *Gârbova*, *Gârboiul*, *Gârbești* also derive. When however the toponym was derived by means of the feminine or neuter possessive ending the result was different because of the back-vowel and the different syllabic division of the word, for instance, *Craiova*, *Hârșova* (*Carsium*), etc. Neither phonetically nor morphologically can a Ukrainian derivation of *Giurgiu* resist philological analysis. Moreover it should not be examined outside its historical and toponymic context.

## II

I had the privilege of knowing Petar Skok for many years, and in view of his noble character I know how much he liked such dispassionate discussion in search of truth. This is a respectful homage that I, a junior of his generation, am paying to him here in remembrance of the many occasions on which I enjoyed his charm and kindness. One occasion merits, perhaps, to be mentioned, not only because it shows Skok's sense of humour and detachment from human vanities and ambitions but even more because it expresses the atmosphere of the world of European scholarship before the Munich crisis of 1938.

It happened during the Second International Congress of Slavonic Philologists which was held in Warsaw in 1934. The delegates of all nations present at the Congress were invited one afternoon to tea by the President of Poland, Professor Mościcki. Being more familiar with Warsaw topography, I had just engaged a small taxi and was about to make my way to the Presidential Palace in the company of the Dutch scholar N,



van Wijk, when we were stopped by our Italian friend M. Bartoli, who pleaded that we should not leave him behind, and not only him, but his friend Petar (Skok), who was slowly descending the stairs of the Polytechnic. As we then caught sight of the German scholar K. H. Meyer, who was an invalid, struggling along, we persuaded the driver not to mind his car being overcrowded by the representatives of five nations one on top of the other, for that was the situation.

M. Bartoli, with his friend on his knees, continued talking and teasing him: 'Petar, always on my head, you are a fine chap! What a pity you are a Croat! What shall we do with him?'—'Oh, just go on talking', replied the smiling Skok. But our German colleague added his advice here: 'I know what we should do. We will divide Croatia between Italy and Germany.' After a moment of uncomfortable silence, our kind-hearted Dutch colleague quietly interposed: 'That solution would not satisfy anybody. Imagine two nice little bits for each, but if we share Germany there will be enough for everybody.' That did not please K. H. Meyer very much. He became slowly red in the face and then burst out: 'Ja, aber sie müssen einen guten Magen haben!' Fortunately at that moment we arrived at the Palace and were ushered along the red carpet into a hall with small tables, at which we took our seats informally. The tall dignified and grey-haired head of the Polish Republic and distinguished scholar moved from one table to another and chatted in a friendly manner to his visitors.

When the time came for us to leave, a semicircle was formed for the photographers, and the President addressed us all in a congenial speech, emphasising that he received us as a colleague and confessing how much he would have liked to remain with his books and in his laboratory, if he had not been called to this higher duty. With the intention of showing us that he received us as a colleague and enjoyed being with us, President Mościcki said he would shake hands with any one of us who, though not a Pole, conversed with him in Polish. He approached my neighbour, a distinguished scholar, whose country happened to have been at war with my country in the first world war and said: 'Here is a Rumanian who speaks Polish.' The reply was: 'I am not a Rumanian, and I do not speak Polish.' I felt Skok's elbow in my ribs, bowed, and whispered: 'Your Excellency, I am guilty of both offences!' The incident passed nearly unobserved, but descending the same wide red carpet, I received from Skok the smiling consolation: 'You were thinking in the car coming here that you would not get your part of the cake!'

And Petar Skok's voice was last heard, after the second world war, in Stockholm in defence of the freedom of thought and science. He died in 1956.